

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 21-12383

v.

Hon. George Caram Steeh

NORMAN C. RHODES,
a/k/a NORMAN CHARLES.. RHODES,
a/k/a NORMAN-CHARLES.. RHODES,
JEANNE K. PARKER-RHODES,
a/k/a JEANNE KAREN.. PARKER-RHODES,
a/k/a JEANNE-KAREN.. PARKER-RHODES,
JULY THIRTYFIRST, and
COUNTY OF ST. CLAIR, MICHIGAN,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION (ECF NO. 22)

Brent-Emory..Johnson¹ filed a motion to dismiss on behalf of Defendant July Thirtyfirst, which the court denied because Johnson is not a lawyer and may not represent another individual or entity in federal court. See ECF No. 21. Johnson has filed a motion for reconsideration and again seeks dismissal of July Thirtyfirst from this action.

¹ The United States alleges that the unusual punctuation used by Johnson is typical of tax protestors.

Johnson argues that he is not “litigating” this case. To the contrary, Johnson is filing motions on behalf of July Thirtyfirst, which constitutes the unauthorized practice of law. With limited exceptions, “[a] person must be a member in good standing of the bar of this court to practice in this court.” Local Rule 83.20 (E.D. Mich.) “The rule against non-lawyer representation protects the rights of those before the court by preventing an ill-equipped layperson from squandering the rights of the party he purports to represent.” *Olagues v. Timken*, 908 F.3d 200, 203 (6th Cir. 2018) (citation omitted). Thus, an artificial entity such as a corporation or a trust “must appear by counsel or not at all.” *Bischoff v. Waldorf*, 660 F. Supp. 2d 815, 820 (E.D. Mich. 2009).

Although Johnson asserts it is an “unjust burden” to require July Thirtyfirst to obtain counsel, it is not within the court’s discretion to allow Johnson to appear on behalf of July Thirtyfirst. The court directs Johnson to Local Rule 83.20, which requires a person practicing before the court to be “a member in good standing of the bar of this court.” Further, “[a] person knowingly violating this provision may, on notice and after hearing, be found guilty of criminal contempt.” LR 83.20(2).

Should Johnson persist in filing papers on behalf of July Thirtyfirst, they will be stricken from the record and he will risk monetary sanctions and/or criminal contempt. See *id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Johnson's motions for reconsideration and to dismiss (ECF No. 22) are DENIED.

Dated: July 14, 2022

s/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on July 14, 2022, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also on Brent-Emory Johnson, P.O. Box 147, Harsens Island, MI 48028.

s/Brianna Sauve
Deputy Clerk